

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO). F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,933		10/08/2004	Elena Voltolina	P16836-US1	6701
27045	7590	09/20/2006		EXAMINER	
ERICSSO		TD:	D'AGOSTA, S	D'AGOSTA, STEPHEN M	
6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PLANO,	PLANO, TX 75024				
				DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commence	10/510,933	VOLTOLINA, ELENA					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2617					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Section 21 Section 2	eptember 2006.						
	action is non-final.						
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-29</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-29</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
_							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<u>-</u>	priority under 25 H C C & 440/o) (d) or (f)					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list Attachment(s)	of the certified copies not receive	ed.					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate					

Application/Control Number: 10/510,933

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9-11-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- 1. The examiner has all the IDS documents now. The examiner's objections to the drawings are overcome. Thank you.
- 2. The applicant argues there is no motivation to combine (and no reason given). The examiner disagrees and gives each claim its broadest reasonable interpretation. The claim does not specify what a first/second radio network can/can't be, hence the examiner interprets them as BTS's/BSC's from different radio networks. Thus during a handoff, one network component is "controlling" the entire operation (eg. both network components). The concept of (soft) handoff is taught by Beven.

Beven specifically teaches everything from the claim except that he doesn't disclose using GAI and transmitting the GAI. The examiner notes that these are well known concepts/entities in cellular networks and would be used by one skilled.

The examiner then put forth both the 3GPP Spec and Rangarajan as teaching using some/all of the "cell identity" to define the location of the mobile unit (eg. Beven teaches using sector ID's). Hence Beven would use sector ids, cell ids, etc. for handoff procedures (as arrived at by the combination).

Lastly, the examiner put forth a motivation to combine (see page 4):

"...It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beven, such that GAI is used, to provide means for using location information to support the handoff procedure by transmitting said location information to the new BSC/BTS so it can more quickly/optimally support the new mobile roaming into it's area/cell...."

Beven teaches sectorized handoffs, so by using cell location information, it can optimize both intra and inter sector handoffs since the network will have a much better understanding of exactly where the mobile is instead of just knowing the mobile is "somewhere" in the sector (and/or connected to a completely different BTS).

3. A more favorable outcome may occur if the applicant were to amend as follows: Claim 21 + 22 + (23 or 24) + (25 or 26) + 27 + 28. (eg. 6 claims combined)

Application/Control Number: 10/510,933

Art Unit: 2617

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 571-272-7862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

STEVE M. D'AGOSTA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9-12-0-0

Page 3